DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 766 HE 003 887

AUTHOR	Ambry, Edward J.; Heiss, George D.
TITLE	A Model Consortium Program for Educational Research Development and Evaluation in New Jersey Colleges. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Montclair State Coll., Upper Montclair, N.J.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Regional Research Program.
BUREAU NO	BR-1-B-019
PUB DATE	Nov 72
GRANT	OEG-2-710019
NOTE	60p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*College Cooperation; *Consortia; *Educational Research; *Higher Education; Institutional Research; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Research; Statewide Planning; Teacher Education; Teacher Educator Education
IDENTIFIERS	New Jersey; *Research Consortium of New Jersey Colleges

ABSTRACT

In September 1971 ten institutions of higher education in New Jersey formed a research consortium that would enable the institutions, each of which has teacher education programs, to develop research programs and research skills within their faculty. The major objectives of the consortium for the first year of operation were: (1) to develop a structure that would establish a close working relationship among colleges offering programs for education majors; (2) to increase the research capabilities of individual faculty members through a structured training program that would acquaint participants with the most current research techniques and facilities available; (3) to establish a structure through which research information, results, and facilities can be disseminated among and within the faculties of member colleges and other institutions; (4) to identify individuals and facilities in member institutions who can aid in the research process; and (5) to encourage research by faculty in the member institutions, consortium-wide research, and research on a statewide level. (HS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 072766

FINAL REPORT

Project No. IB019
Grant No. OEG-2-710019

Approved for
John Gobel
John Gobel
Educational Research
Branch - Rm 1013
26 Federal Plaza
New York, New York 10007
NCERD
HE

Research Consortium Of New Jersey Colleges

Caldwell
Glassboro State
Jersey City State
Monmouth
Montclair State
Newark State
William Paterson
Rider
Trenton State
Upsala

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

November 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Consortium Office
Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

HEd 3.287

ED 072766

FINAL REPORT
Project No. IB019
Grant No. OEG-2-710019

A MODEL CONSORTIUM PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION IN NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

November, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

FINAL REPORT

Project No. IB019
Grant No. OEG-2-710019

November 1972

A MODEL CONSORTIUM PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION IN NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Consortium Directors:

Edward J. Ambry, Ph.D.
George D. Heiss, D.Ed.

College Coordinators:

Caldwell	Mr. Thomas Tully	Newark State	Dr. Caesar Gaza
Glassboro State	Dr. John Smart	William Paterson	Dr. Edward Ward
Jersey City State	Dr. Glenn Reeling	Rider	Mr. Edward Taylor
Monmouth	Dr. Robert Rouse	Trenton State	Mr. Donn Herring
Montclair State	Dr. George Rotter	Upsala	Dr. Kenneth Rystrom

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a Grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
CHAPTER ONE:	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	Statement of Needs and Objectives	1
CHAPTER TWO:	ADMINISTRATION, METHODS, PROCEDURES AND RESULTS	5
	Objective 1. To Develop a Structure	5
	Objective 2. To Increase Research Capabilities	7
	Objective 3. To Disseminate Information	9
	Objective 4. To Identify Personnel Resources	10
	Objective 5. To Encourage Faculty Research	12
CHAPTER THREE:	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
APPENDIX A	Minutes of Meetings	18-38
APPENDIX B	Programs	40-56

Chapter I

Introduction

Background

During the academic year 1967-68, an invitation was sent to all colleges and universities in New Jersey to meet and explore the feasibility of forming a Research Consortium. One consortium plan that served as a focal point for discussion was the New York State model used at the State University Colleges at Fredonia and Buffalo. Its program extended over three years from June 1967 to June 1970 with the basic purpose to encourage research productivity among faculty through a series of training seminars, and the development of supportive resources and services.

Several of the larger New Jersey institutions expressed an interest, but felt that they were self-sufficient and did not desire to join such a consortium. At ensuing meetings during that year and the following academic year, ten institutions made a firm commitment to join the proposed consortium. Attendees at this series of meetings returned to their respective institutions and elicited a letter of agreement from the Presidents of their respective colleges to join and actively support a proposal to form a research consortium.

The consortium was formed and several proposals for financial assistance were submitted to the U. S. Office of Education. A final proposal submitted on September 1, 1970 resulted in a grant of $9,396.00 from Region II, U. S. Office of Education, Research Division. The grant was for the period 9/16/71 through 2/15/72 and was eventually extended through July 1972.

Statement of Need and Objectives

More than ever before, this nation's educators are turning to research

for aid in solving the pressing problems of the learner. The field of research and development, however, is just approaching recognition commensurate with its potential importance. Education has been slow in selling the importance of this aspect of learning to the community. Business and industry have long acknowledged the significance of research to successful achievement of basic purposes, allocating in many industries as much as twenty per cent of their total budget, according to some experts. It is understood that recent estimates indicate only one tenth of one percent of local school budgets in America is being spent on research and development.

Most educational research that is accomplished is undertaken by the large universities and specialized colleges with a negligible contribution emanating from the smaller colleges which have tended to allocate a large portion of their budgets and resources to the teacher preparation programs.

In addition, a wide gap exists between the research being performed in major universities and the implementation of its products in the schools. It is proposed that given the necessary skills and supportive conditions, the small colleges can be in a unique position to help bridge this gap. The immediate challenge to the smaller colleges in New Jersey then is to implement intelligent involvement in research. As Keppel noted in 1964, "Only when educators at all levels join cooperatively in attacking the education problems, can change be effectively induced."

The Consortium's long-range goal has been to strengthen research efforts among the member colleges, develop supportive administrative structure, and to achieve a number of specific objectives.

All of the ten colleges involved have teacher education programs. In all, research has at best served an ancillary function. It is strongly held, however, that while a "publish or perish" atmosphere is not desirable,

a better balance between teaching and research functions is essential. Two problems, however, make achievement of the balance by individual schools prohibitively difficult. First, there is not an ample budgetary allotment at any college for developing a coordinated program in research. Second, expertise in the areas of design, analysis, and funding is largely absent. These problems are not unique to the New Jersey Colleges by any means. Small colleges focusing on teacher education have been and remain traditionally committed to teaching and service.

In colleges which sponsor teacher training, the impact of an increased emphasis on research can have other ramifications. Research attitudes find a natural ground for dissemination at institutions producing teachers for the nation's schools. Thus, a stimulation of research attitude and practice at colleges preparing educators could logically result in growing stimulation of applied research in the schools.

The importance of research orientation should be emphasized even for school or college people who may never actually design and carry out a full scale study. Graduates and undergraduate students should be familiar with scholarly research in education, and, if only as consumers, it is important that they be able to evaluate research reports found in professional publications. As W. J. Popham observes, if teachers are professionals and "really intend to use the newer discoveries of their field, they should become adept in comprehending at least the most commonly used....procedures."

To meet the needs expressed by the Consortium member institutions, a program for 1971-72 was developed and administered by the Consortium Directors and Institution Representatives. The program was designed to meet the following specific objectives:

1. To develop a structure that would establish a close working relationship among colleges offering programs for education majors.

2. To increase the research capabilities of individual faculty members through a structured training program that would acquaint participants with the most current research techniques and facilities available.

3. To establish a structure through which research information, results, and facilities can be disseminated among and within the faculties of member colleges and other institutions.

4. To identify individuals (and facilities) in member institutions who can aid in the research process.

5. To encourage the following: research by faculty in the member institutions of the consortium; consortium-wide research; research on a statewide level.

The information gathered for this report is based on the five primary Consortium objectives listed above. Chapter II is structured around these and presents appropriate results and comment. Chapter III is presented as a succinct summary of the Consortium's tangible impact and suggestions for future activities.

CHAPTER II

Administration, Methods, Procedures, and Results

This chapter constitutes the main body of the report since it attempts to relate the specific objectives of the Consortium to activities undertaken during the period of funding by the U. S. Office of Education.

The format for this report as described in the document entitled "Preparing Research Reports for the U. S. Office of Education," does not lend itself to the type of report being submitted. Therefore, the writers have taken the liberty of changing the suggested headings and design.

The funds provided under the "Small Grants" program are not specifically intended for programs such as those undertaken by the Consortium. The Consortium is grateful that Region II of the U. S. Office of Education evidenced flexibility in making the grant to organize the Consortium. This reorganized report format best describes the Research Consortium achievements and will assist the reader in interpreting the results claimed by the Consortium.

Each of the five objectives included in the proposal for funding by Region II, U. S. Office of Education, and which were identified in the previous chapter are highlighted in this chapter with appropriate comments and results cited. Conclusions and recommendations will be found in Chapter III.

Objective 1. To develop a structure that would establish a close working relationship among colleges offering programs for education majors.

Comments

Several years of planning and proposal writing preceded the formal organization of the Research Consortium of New Jersey Colleges. With each drafting of a proposal, the plan for an administrative structure was refined. Consequently, upon receipt of the small grant from the United States Office of Education it was a relatively easy task to organize.

Ten colleges agreed to join the Consortium. Ten Presidents appointed representatives to the Coordinating Council and Co-Directors were elected. Minutes of all meetings were recorded with copies sent to all colleges. Questionnaires, program announcements, Consortium plans, and all other communications were relayed to local faculty by the respective college representatives.

The Coordinating Council functioned as a Board of Directors, Planning Committee, data gatherer and liaison between the Consortium and the individual colleges. Each representative devoted long hours in discharging his responsibilities. The remuneration was insignificant when measured against the work load carried by each individual and the Coordinating Council collectively, and represented out-of-pocket expenses incurred by the participants.

Two major programs were held at two member colleges (Rider and Newark State). For these specific programs the college representatives wore the "host" hat and were pressed into service to arrange for meals, meeting rooms, name tags, etc., etc. The mutual respect developed for each representative and their institutions was a "bonus" which was achieved. This feeling of cooperation facilitated the operation of the Consortium.

Members of the Coordinating Council served as speakers or consultants or supplemented the consultants who were participating in the training programs.

The need for a consortium effort was established; it became a reality and functioned well.

Results

The organization structure is intact. The small grant awarded by the United States Office of Education provided the impetus for a formal organization. The funds were judiciously budgeted and allocated.

The type of grant awarded is not renewable and the Consortium, to continue

its operation, will have to seek additional funding. Therefore, the Coordinating Council plans to meet early in the Fall, 1972 to review its previous year's achievements and to seek support from member colleges, the New Jersey State Department of Higher Education, and other sources in order to carry out future plans.

Objective II: To increase the research cababilities of individual faculty members through a structured training program that would acquaint participants with the most current research techniques and facilities available.

Comments

Two organized training programs were developed and carried out to accomplish this objective. A workshop type format was employed to facilitate a participant-centered approach. Experts in various areas of research proposal writing and funding were secured to lead the sessions and act as consultants to small groups and individuals. The Fall 1971 program entitled "Writing and Funding Research Proposals" emphasized basic research skills and types of funding sources. The Spring 1972 program, "Supervised Proposal Writing Workshop" focused directly on the step by step process of writing a proposal. (See Appendix B for program details).

On October 13, 1971, the first session of the Fall program was held at Rider College, Trenton, New Jersey. Experts in government, industrial and foundation funding were secured. The morning segment was devoted to presentations by these experts followed by question and answer periods. Afternoon segments featured large group panel discussions and small group working sessions. Participants were encouraged to begin a rough proposal outline. This first all-day session culminated with a dinner and talk given by the Director of Research, Planning and Evaluation of the New Jersey State Department of Education. The registration roster showed that 67 persons attended.

The second session of the Fall program took place on November 10th at Rider College with an emphasis on project planning, design and analysis. Experts in survey designs, experimental designs, performance objectives and management systems made presentations in the morning segments. In the afternoon, small group workshops were held in each of these areas and then repeated later so that one participant could attend several different sessions. Participants were encouraged to write a proposal suitable for criticism by a professional reader. Some participants continued to express a need for more details related to sources of funding.

With these requests in mind, a third session was organized. On March 22, 1972, four persons received criticisms on their proposals, while another group received additional details on guidelines and sources of funding about such agencies as Office of Education, National Science Foundation, Public Health Service and the National Endowment for the Humanities. This session concluded with a case study of a proposal not funded to identify strengths and weaknesses of a good proposal.

On April 12, 1972, the first session of the Spring program was held at Newark State College, Union, New Jersey. The purpose of this program was to provide direct assistance to faculty in their preparation of a research proposal suitable for submission to an appropriate agency. As an additional incentive, the Consortium set aside $2,000 for grants to be awarded for the best proposals. The condition for participation in this program stipulated that interested faculty have a written outline upon which a formal proposal could be constructed.

The organized sessions held in April and May were supplemented by numerous individual conferences between the consultants and individual participants. The six consultants who were engaged by the Consortium were experts in budget-

ing, research design, evaluation and data organization and analysis. The results of these programs are discussed under Objective V.

Objective III: To establish a structure through which research information, results, and facilities can be disseminated among and within the faculties of member colleges and other institutions.

Comments

This was probably the most difficult objective to achieve in the limited life span of the grant.

Some exchange of information was accomplished at Coordinating Council meetings and at the faculty training programs conducted by the Consortium. Institutional representatives and faculty participants in the training sessions had opportunities to inform each other regarding individual faculty members' research efforts as well as various institutional research programs and activities. This exchange was valuable and in most cases was carried back to member institutions for discussion and dissemination.

A Region II, USOE representative and a Special Assistant for Education from the New Jersey State Department of Higher Education's Washington, D.C. office furnished participants in the workshops valuable information about sources of funding for research proposals and distributed brochures which identified funding programs, key personnel, and other data.

One specific Consortium project which helped to establish a dissemination structure was the administration of the questionnaire associated with the "Survey of Research Capability" described in Objective IV. Faculty members at the ten member institutions were asked to identify research projects which they had completed, those in which they were currently engaged, and describe unique research equipment or facilities available to them at their colleges or at other locations. Their responses identified research projects

and listed such items as computers, calculators, laboratories, on and off campus equipment and facilities, and other unique research tools. The listing was included in the bound, compiled, all inclusive copies which were distributed to each institution. Two copies are available at each college - one in the institutional Representative's office and the other in the College library. These copies are available to anyone seeking such information.

If time had permitted, a newsletter or some other information organ describing the availability of research reports and unique facilities might have been developed. The Consortium may provide this if it continues to function.

Results

Information was exchanged on an informal basis and a better understanding was gained of state and federal services available to local colleges.

Listings of reports and facilities were formally brought together through the compilation of the document entitled, "Survey of Research Capability," which is available at each member institution.

While movement toward the achievement of this objective was accomplished, much remains to be done to produce a structure which would provide a viable exchange process.

Objective IV. To identify individuals and facilities in member institutions who can aid the research process.

Early in the Consortium's history, it was emphasized that there was a continuing and growing need for research consultants and evaluators to aid with the many present and future state and local projects funded by State and Federal funds. The need for the development of some kind of resource bank to facilitate the location and placement of such persons was accepted as an important Consortium responsibility.

The project to develop a directory of research personnel was initiated

during the early spring of 1971. At this time, a "Survey of Research Capability" was developed and adminstered on each member campus by the local coordinator. This instrument was designed to gather essential information regarding research background, capabilities and interest and was circulated to all professional staff on each campus.

At the May 7, 1971 meeting of the Consortium Board, it was agreed that each campus would supply the Consortium office with 25 compiled copies of the original survey instrument arranged in alphabetical order, with each compiled copy consisting of all staff wishing to be included. With this data, the Consortium office: a) distributed to each campus two compiled copies from each of the member campuses; b) developed an abridged master directory with an alphabetical listing of names and areas of specialization, thus providing a convenient cross reference.

During the summer and early fall of 1971, local campuses collected and organized their data for the directory project and November 1, 1971, was set as the cut off date for submission of information to the Consortium office. At the January 25, 1972 meeting of consortium directors, two copies of the compiled basic directory for each of the ten member colleges were made available to each of the campuses. It was suggested these copies be bound, one copy held by the local coordinator and one copy placed in the college library. The format, number of copies, and printing cost estimates for the abridged directory were discussed and approved. It was decided to provide enough copies for the total staff of the member colleges.

Results

During July 1972, 5,000 copies of the directory were received from the printer and were later distributed to each faculty member, New Jersey school districts, State Department of Education, industry and other government agen-

cies. Through this directory and its companion volume, "A Survey of Research Capability" literally thousands of people at all levels and with varying needs have a convenient source for the identification and location of persons with a variety of research capabilities and interests.

Objective V. To encourage the following: (1) research by faculty in member institutions of the Consortium; (2) consortium-wide research, and (3) research on a statewide level.

Comments

This objective relates directly to the major goal of the Research Consortium which is to strengthen research efforts throughout New Jersey and particularly at member institutions.

In a sense, this objective is interwoven into all of the other objectives. All of the time and effort expended by the Co-Directors, institutional representatives, program participants and others was directed at the encouragement of research undertakings by individuals, institutions, and state agencies. The mere fact that a Consortium was formed served as a catalyst. Several member institutions reported that, for the first time, a line item was included in college budgets for research. Some institutional representatives indicated that this inclusion was a direct result of having joined the Consortium and the commitment of their institutions to support its activities. Other representatives reported that increases in existing budget items for research had a direct or indirect relationship to the fact that the Consortium had been formed.

In the training programs sponsored by the Consortium, encouragement was given to faculty participants to "put their ideas on paper." The programs offered a variety of ideas about organization of proposals, funding sources, writing skills, research design, and techniques for carrying out educational research.

The second three day workshop sponsored by the Consortium in the spring of 1972 established a criteria for admission which required each prospective workshop participant to submit an outline for a specific research project. This admission requirement limited the number of workshoppers but was a powerful pre-workshop tool to "weed out" those who wanted to attend but were not willing to produce a product. It proved to be an excellent device for identifying serious prospective researchers and resulted in an end product of thirteen well-defined research proposals. One incentive for the submission of proposals was the pre-conference annoucement that the Consortium would make cash awards to the best proposal writers to encourage them to undertake the project or to expand the proposal for submission to another funding source.

Training session evaluations by the participants indicated that the vast majority of participants valued their workshop experiences and were encouraged to embark on a new research project or to expand their research effort at their respective institutions.

The Consortium feels that this objective was accomplished. As with most ventures, not all was achieved in the short span of one year and further encouragement is needed. It is the hope of the Consortium that member institutions will continue to encourage faculty research and that the State Department of Higher Education will assist in this encouragement.

Results

Much encouragement was given and faculty were trained in research techniques and methods.

Budget items for research at several member institutions were included for the first time or increased, if such an item was previously included.

Thirteen research proposals were prepared by faculty members from the ten member institutions.

Incentive awards in the amount of $400.00 each were granted to five faculty for the following proposals:

1. Status of Nutrition Education in the State of New Jersey.
2. Learning Efficiency Using Visual Imagery and Verbal Summarizing of Lecture, Textual and Pictorial Materials
3. The Effects of a Special School Program in the Study of Television on the Television Viewing Habits of Fifth Grade Children
4. Efficient Reading as a Function of Redundancy Reduction, Practice Effect and Selected Cognitive Variables
5. A Comparative Ecological Study of Tidal Marshlands Ditched for Mosquito Control and Natural Marshlands in New Jersey

No attempt was made to follow up workshop participants from the first workshop held in the fall of 1971, but indirectly it was reported that several applied the skills and knowledge gained at the workshop by writing research proposals which were submitted to local college committees for support or were submitted to other funding sources.

Chapter III

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The idea for forming a Research Consortium was sound. Time and effort expended were worthwhile. Recommendation: The Consortium should continue to function in order to promote, coordinate and sustain research efforts at member institutions. Funds from the N. J. Department of Higher Education and member colleges should be pooled to underwrite Consortium operations. We suggest an average of $2,000 per institution contribution with a matching grant from the State Department of Higher Education. (Perhaps a funding formula based on $250.00 per 1,000 full-time students equivalent would be appropriate.)

2. The initial small grant for 1971-72 resulted in limiting membership in the Consortium to ten colleges. Recommendation: Membership should be expanded to include other institutions.

3. The Consortium was formed to meet certain needs described in the original proposal and in this report. Although some of the needs were met, many still exist and in addition new needs have been identified. Recommendation: Member institutions should assess their local short and long range needs for research activities and statewide needs should be identified.

4. A high degree of cooperation by member institutions was evident in all undertakings during the academic year 1971-72. Recommendation: Capitalizing on this new found working relationship, cooperative research efforts should be undertaken.

5. It was found that several member colleges had existing budget items which provided for individual faculty research opportunities. The State Department of Higher Education has informed the State Colleges that provisions can be made in future budgets for line-item requests for faculty research positions.

This major breakthrough in providing research funds will allow the colleges to achieve some of the objectives of the Consortium and should lead the private colleges into making provisions for similar faculty positions. When research becomes an integral part of faculty work load, great strides can be taken at member institutions. Recommendation: Where budget provisions have not been made, this practice should be initiated.

6. As a result of membership in this Consortium, several colleges formed local faculty research councils or committees. Representatives exchanged organizational plans for formation of such councils which enabled other institutions to use these plans as models. Recommendation: Institutions which do not have such a council are encouraged to form one, and in those institutions where they exist, such councils should become more viable.

7. Workshop participant evaluations indicate that the participant-centered format with consultant help and the use of incentive awards, constituted the most highly favored type of program and produced the greatest results. Recommendation: Workshops emphasizing these components should be continued as principal consortium programs.

8. The Clearinghouse function of the Consortium provided for exchanging information, compiling lists of faculty researchers, funding sources, programs sponsored by the U.S.O.E. and other agencies, and general dissemination of ideas and practices. Recommendation: Such a clearinghouse should be included in statewide planning for Higher Education in New Jersey.

9. The Consortium publication entitled, A Directory of Research Personnel in Ten New Jersey Colleges is a useful document which has been distributed to member institutions, other colleges and universities, and schools throughout New Jersey. Recommendation: This Directory should be updated periodically.

APPENDIX A

MINUTES OF MEETINGS

December 9, 1970
March 10, 1971
May 7, 1971
June 2, 1971
September 22, 1971
January 25, 1972
February 24, 1972
May 10, 1972

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - December 9, 1970
President's Dining Room - Montclair
Ed Ambry and George Heiss Presiding

1. A brief history of this research consortium was presented by Ed Ambry and commented on by others. Its development was traced from suggestions by John Sokol and Glenn Reeling during 1968 based on their observations of the New York State experience. It was noted that several proposals were written over a two year period, each reduced in money and purpose due to the various pressures in force at the time, finally culminating in the present very limited proposal.

2. It was moved that George Heiss be designated as co-director for the remainder of the 1970-71 academic year, assuming responsibilities for arranging future meetings and coordinating activities. This action was approved by the board with a voice vote.

3. John Sokol reported and commented on the following:

(1) Approval of the present proposal should be forthcoming in the near future, i.e., it is on the desk to be signed when the present freeze is lifted.

(2) This consortium to proceed at the earliest date with developing a resource bank of consultants and materials.

(3) Use of direct phone call to his office may get more results than a formal letter.

(4) Cited the value of the New York State Research Foundation in aiding the colleges in that state with writing proposals, getting materials and scheduling visits to Washington.

(5) Described the federal government's small grant program (under $10,000) and its advantages.

(6) Suggested that the chief failure in many proposals submitted was their inadequate review of the literature - not knowing what has already been done.

(7) Cited justification for the relatively small grant in our case as at least providing: (a) some seed money for additional funding, (b) small amounts of money to individuals, and (c) the positive psychology of maintaining an on-going organization. (It was pointed out by the group at this time that several colleges had gotten money in their budgets for research and are at present funding their own projects - Paterson, Monmouth and Upsala).

(8) Possibility of sharing physical equipment and some materials among the colleges and use of government surplus. (It was suggested by the group that experiences with government surplus had been largely negative and better results were obtained on conjunction with private industry).

(9) In answering the question, "what constitutes a valid research project", he suggested that other activities than direct generation of knowledge were acceptable. He cited the PREP packages as an example.

4. Glen Reeling reported that he was planning an all day session on research at Jersey City for sometime in the spring of 1971 and will contact the Consortium later about this program.

5. John Casey reported a need for consultants and evaluators to work with various state projects now in operation: (1) under Title 3, (2) the recent $400,000 state grant for four research and demonstration centers, and (3) the sixteen task forces concerned with evaluating teacher performance in behavioral terms.

6. George Heiss reported on some ideas that may be helpful in planning future activities for this consortium. An abstract of a speech by a leader in educational research was distributed to the group for further consideration if so desired. The main point was that generation of knowledge is only one of several functions necessary in upgrading education. To what extent, if any, should the consortium consider these other research related functions?

7. John Casey, Ed Ambry and George Heiss agreed to compile a suggested format and procedure for developing a resource bank of consultants for the State of New Jersey.

8. Charity Runden described briefly the research program being conducted by George Rotter in the Human Sexuality Institute at Montclair. She asked that member colleges be alert to the need for several thousand subjects for this project.

9. It was agreed not to set a specific date for the next meeting.

Attendance

Glen Reeling - Jersey City
Larry Bellagamba - Montclair
Sister Rita Margaret - Caldwell
Arnold Speert - Paterson
Mildred Weil - Paterson
Charity Renden - Montclair
Ed Taylor - Rider
Robert Ogden - Montclair
John Casey - N. J. State Dept. of Ed.
John Sokol - U. S. O. E.
Jean Simson - Upsala
Gerhard Lang - Montclair
George Heiss - Montclair
Ed Ambry - Montclair

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - March 10, 1971
Executive Dining Room: 1:30 - 4:00
Ed Ambry and George Heiss Presiding

1. General comments on the grant award and practical operational details:

   (1) Although the actual money award has not been granted - and this should happen soon - John Sokol will follow up. The operational budget details need to be worked out with the Montclair State College business office.

   (2) Although the grant period will run from Feb. 16, 1971 to Feb. 15, 1972, this period can be extended to accommodate planning for the college academic year, Sept. 1971 to June, 1972.

   (3) In answer to the question of expansion of consortium to include additional state and private colleges, it was agreed not to invite expansion at this time because of very limited funds. A letter of information only will be sent to the two new state colleges. (Ramapo and Stockton).

   (4) John Sokol again emphasized the importance of using the grants of the under $10,000 type.

   (Notification of Grant Award actually arrived on MSC campus, March 18, 1971)

2. In regard to the directory project, discussion centered around the following:

   (1) The purpose of the directory is to identify the Consortium's resources; therefore, those outside the ten member colleges will not be included except for the resources available through the State Department of Education.

   (2) Should all professors on each campus be contacted? All disciplines included? At this time we agreed it should be open to all disciplines, and not just those in education departments.

   (3) The question of criteria for distinguishing between those actually doing research and those doing something less. A problem for local campus decision.

   (4) This initial survey may turn out to be only a first step in compiling the directory, due to the above problems and the technical problems of printing and publishing. (Cost of publication).

   (5) It is expected that each college will have data from the questionnaires for feedback and discussion at the Spring meeting.

(6) It was asked that each college representative write a short cover letter designed for the individual facility in order to facilitate this project and asking that the questionnaires be returned to them.

(A point came up after the meeting focusing on the question of whether or not to include part-time faculty. It is suggested that they be included but identified as a separate group at this time.)

3. In regard to the internal organization of the consortium (board of trustees) discussion centered around the following:

   (1) The need for official letters of appointment or re-appointment from each college president. This will be initiated by a letter from the Montclair State College President (Dr. Thomas Richardson) to each of the member college presidents.

   (2) The consortium's proposal suggests that "the Board of Directors will organize themselves, set parliamentary rules, and determine dates for meetings." To be settled at the spring meeting.

4. Input from Ray Paul, Montclair State College, regarding his course on communication skills for students with potential, yet who do not meet the conventional admission requirements. His purpose was to inform others and develop interest in what appears to be a very successful program in a vital area. Our purpose is to begin dealing with the problem, receiving this type of input and disseminating it as well as handling requests for seed money - both major purposes of the consortium.

5. In regard to the role of the college representative on his campus, discussion centered around the following:

   (1) Can each representative carry out the duties as suggested on page 6 of the consortium's proposal in light of the greatly reduced budget?

   (2) How do the roles described conflict with the research structures and functions now in operation at the various campuses?

   (3) It was asked that each representative attempt to clarify this problem and be prepared for discussion at the Spring meeting.

6. In regard to a tentative statewide meeting being planned by Glenn Reeling, discussion centered around the following:

   (1) What kind of meeting - content, structure, who involved, etc.?

   (2) How will it fit in with the consortium's program objectives?

   (3) It was suggested that we determine the consortium's program first. Perhaps a general all-state meeting in the fall with a series of local follow-ups and a culminating meeting in the late spring. This is a logical sequence, yet the larger problem of finding a

conceptual framework on which to design the total program still remains.

(4) It was suggested that a person knowledgeable in consortia administration and planning consult with us at our spring meeting. It was agreed that Niam Sefein (New York State) will be contacted for this purpose. If he is not available, others will be approached so that the spring meeting can focus on planning for next year.

7. The question of evaluation was raised. It was agreed that such discrete instruments as the Semantic Differential Scale and the Research Attitude Scale need not be studied at this time.

8. Annoucements by John Casey:

(1) Contact him for information about V.E.R.B., a system for transmission of voice and written notes and diagrams of an instructor to an off-campus audience.

(2) For film courses in designing experimental research, contact:

Mr. John R. Van Horn
Manager, Professional Development
The Training and Development Dept.
Westinghouse Learning Corp.
P. O. Box 2278
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230

Attendance

Thomas Tully - Caldwell
Harry Lyda - Jersey City
Glen Reeling - Jersey City
George Heiss - Montclair
Ed Ambry - Montclair
Allan Morehead - Montclair
John E. Gallagher - Newark (for Richard Nichols)
John J. Casey - N. J. Dept. of Ed.
Ed Taylor - Rider
Arthur M. Steinman - Trenton
John Sokol - U. S. O. E.
Eben Johnson - Upsala (for Dr. Jean Simmons)
Arnold Speert - William Paterson

Absent: Glassboro
Monmouth

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES
Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - May 7, 1971
Formal Lounge - Downs Hall, Newark State College
Ed Ambry and George Heiss Presiding

I. General comments on operational details and basic policy.

1. Local arrangements have been completed at Montclair State for a secretary, administering the budget, etc. to carry on a central office for the consortium.
2. It was agreed that each campus would "take turns" supporting the general meetings of the consortium. Monmouth College has volunteered for the June 2nd meeting. There will be more details on this in a follow-up letter to these minutes.
3. It was agreed that the seed money portion of our budget go for individual faculty projects rather than attempting directly to secure more funds for the consortium. This does not preclude an individual faculty member from proposing a project that would benefit the consortium directly. The question of how to allocate these limited funds still remains an issue.
4. The role of the campus coordinator is still not clarified.
5. The status of each campus research committee was not polled and reported.

II. General comments on the DIRECTORY. After an extensive discussion, the following guidelines are suggested to facilitate the development of our DIRECTORY and planning for next years.

1. Each campus will continue to survey its staff with the original form. (A quick poll at the May 7th meeting revealed relatively few responses on all but one campus). Also each person is asked to identify his department, as this is not now called for on the form.
2. In addition, each person will be asked to identify the area of research specialization according to the list of "Areas of Specialization" (passed out at May 7th meeting). New categories may be added, of course.
3. Finally, each person should be asked to respond to the "Workshop Questionnaire" (sent to each campus coordinator with the March 10th meeting minutes). We need this data for planning next year's program.
4. Supply the missing data for those persons who responded to our first form only, i.e., "Survey of Research Capability." That includes departmental affiliation, their selection of areas of specialization and their response to the "Workshop Questionnaire."
5. Each local campus will supply the consortium directors with:
   (1) Data for each faculty member including Area of Specialization, name and department.
   (2) 25 compiled copies of the original form "Survey of Research Capability" arranged in alphabetical order, each copy consisting of all staff wishing to be included.

6. The consortium directors expect to:
   (1) Distribute to each campus two compiled copies from each of the other member campuses - each campus may then develop its own system for handling these; thus there will be no hold up at the consortium central office.
   (2) Develop an abridged master directory of all ten campuses structured basically by areas of specialization with each area of specialization subdivided by colleges, and under each college the name and department of the persons claiming that particular area of specialization.
   (3) Include in the prefatory remarks such ideas as:
      (a) This directory is a limited edition both in time and content; additional information can be obtained from persons themselves or local campus coordinators.
      (b) Identifying oneself with an area of specialization implies some interest and expertise; however, verifying the credibility of these lies with the consumer.
      (c) A list of local campus coordinators.

III. Planning with Sefein - the suggestions and discussion centered around the following: (Based on the operation of C.O.R.D. - Consortium on Research Development).

1. According to Sefein, the New York program was based primarily on three components:
   (a) Weekly seminars on each campus which were organized and run by each local campus coordinator with little or no expense to the consortium. These sessions functioned as a kind of research club where ideas and papers were discussed and criticized, with members gaining skills in presenting papers to the larger professional groups. See Sefein's blue booklet summary report for details.
   (b) Off campus two-day workshops for 20 - 25 interested staff from all member colleges, which focused on specifically needed research skills. About one fourth of the budget went for this type of activity. See same booket for details.
   (c) Pilot or feasibility studies by individuals so as to actually gain experience in producing a research type product. Most of the budget went for these individual projects. See same booklet for details.
   (d) Sefein passed out six different materials for our perusal.

      (1) Component Skills in Applied Research
      (2) Program Rationale for CORD
      (3) Procedural Guidelines for Recipients of Funds for Pilot Studies under CORD
      (4) Evaluation Sheets for Pilot Projects Proposals under CORD
      (5) Handbook of Policies Affecting Faculty Involvement in Organized Research
      (6) Guidelines for Planning the Seventh Faculty Research Training Seminar.

2. Some comments made during the Sefein presentation:

   (a) Sending a copy of the DIRECTORY to all staff members of the

consortium might serve as a stimulus for more persons to get involved and thus carry us beyond the original purpose of the DIRECTORY.

(b) A major problem was encountered in getting people to write proposals for pilot projects. They did not want to go through the red tape. This was overcome by giving them $50 on the basis of a preliminary discussion. The person was asked to clarify his thoughts, then submit them later on paper. The paper was then criticized and re-written as a proposal.
(c) It was agreed that the student centered-doing workshop using a variety of materials and the consultant as a guide was much superior to the consultant centered-student listening type format.
(d) Workshop procedures and content can be delineated for consultants "to prevent them from doing whatever they want to."
(e) There are problems in adminstration and with administrators: lack of freedom, lack of experience in research, faculty load, sources of funding and materials.
(f) The suggestion was made that a "break even" fee be charged.
(g) It was pointed out that the separation into teaching faculty and research faculty was unhealthy. These two functions go hand in hand and stimulate each other.
(h) Workshops should stress fundamentals and build from these.
(i) The first workshop should be devoted to proposal writing.
(j) Others--

Attendance

Thomas Tully - Caldwell
Harry Lyda - Jersey City
Glen Reeling - Jersey City
George Heiss - Montclair
Ed Ambry - Montclair
Larry Bellagamba - Montclair
Richard Nichols - Newark
Caesar Gaza - Newark
Robert Rouse - Monmouth
John Casey - N. J. Department of Ed.
Ed Taylor - Rider
John Sokol - U.S.O.E.
Kenneth Rystrom - Upsala
Arnold Speert - William Paterson
Mildred Weil - William Paterson
Naim Sefein - Fredonia State College, New York

Absent: Glassboro
Trenton

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES
Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - June 2, 1971
The Old Board Room - Woodrow Wilson Hall, Monmouth College
Ed Ambry and George Heiss Presiding

I. Reports on the status of the various campus research committees.

1. Caldwell College - no committee as yet, consortium representative working directly with the president.

Jersey City - no committee as yet; attempts will be made this September to organize a campus-wide group using the present college structure and government.

Monmouth College - at present there exists a "grants in aid for creativity committee" of seven members, one of whom represents teacher education.

Montclair State College - an eight member committee representing all the schools of the college was organized this May. One meetint was held and the group was acquainted with the purposes of the consortium and various questionnaires and forms were discussed, then distributed.

Newark State College - at present there exists a three to five member college-wide committee appointed by the president to award small grants.

Rider College - at present there is a presidential committee of three members, each representing a school. It passes on in-house research and awards small grants.

William Paterson College - this college has developed its own research structure made up of the various college department heads, and a program which includes newsletters and small grants in aid from local funds. At present it is assuming responsibility for carrying out the consortium's objectives.

2. A discussion following these reports revealed that the status of local research structures and functions and their relation to the consortium's structures and functions is not clear on many campuses. It was suggested that every effort be made by the consortium campus representative to use or become a part of what now exists as a research agency on his campus. To facilitate this it was agreed to change the proposal wording on page 6, I, 1, (c) to read:

"Chairing or serve on that local college committee which shall coordinate all activities related to consortium structure and function locally."

II. Continued absences of several consortium members.

1. It was agreed that Ed Ambry would check on the situation at Glassboro. Ed Taylor will do the same for Trenton State. In addition, George Heiss will seek clarification from Upsala concerning their campus representative.

III. Additional discussion and agreements on the DIRECTORY produced the following:

1. Each campus will provide the consortium central office with 25 collated copies of "Survey of Research Capability" to serve as a master or detailed directory of researchers.

2. Each campus will provide the consortium central office with a 3 x 5 ABRIDGED DIRECTORY CARD with the following format:

Name _____ _____ _____ Degree _____
Last First Initial

College _____ Dept. _____

Specialization Areas: _____

_____

_____

3. The ABRIDGED DIRECTORY CARDS will be supplied to the consortium central office by June 21, 1971. These materials will then be turned over to Glenn Reeling and Harry Lejda at Jersey City State for processing.

4. How many abridged directories will be compiled and who will receive them has not been definitely decided.

IV. Results of the "Workshop Questionnaire."

1. Montclair State, Rider and Caldwell were the only campuses to report results.

2. Out of 39 returns, Montclair State ranked writing proposals first, defining a research problem second, and research design third.

3. Out of thirty odd returns Rider ranked writing research reports for publication first, defining a research problem second, and research design third.

4. Out of four returns Caldwell ranked compiling a bibliography first, writing research reports for publication second, research design third and defining a research problem fourth.

5. It is suggested that this project be followed up now and in the early fall on the other campuses, so that we will have more input for program planning later this fall.

6. During the discussion of these results two ideas were stressed: (a) the need for leadership at each campus to stimulate research through pushing for more research type courses and local research activities, and (b) the need for identifying research objectives and activities which cut across and are common to all the members of the consortium as topics for workshops.

7. It was agreed that the first general workshop would be on proposal writing.

V. Guidelines for workshops

1. Limit enrollment to 75 persons

2. Plan for three sessions per day: A.M., P.M. and evening or late afternoon to ensure closure.

3. Set a common problem for most participants to consist of writing a proposal under EPDA to train a group such as our campus coordinators to carry on local campus research training activities. Other campus groups and topics are also possibilities for this type of proposal writing.

4. Morning sessions would be devoted to pertinent topics presented to the total workshop by a group of consultants. These same consultants would each handle an afternoon small group (ability, interest, etc.) assisted by our consortium coordinators. These afternoon sessions would be intensive work sessions.

5. Arrange for suitable workshop materials through our consultants. Many other sources also available. An example is Research Foundation of State University of New York (Box 7126, Albany, N. Y. 12224).

6. Aim toward limiting budget spending to $1,000, charging a break even fee and writing up brochure.

7. Tentative date set for October 13, 1971 for first workshop at Rider College. (Note: Ed Ambry and Ed Taylor have begun working out details.

8. Hold a follow-up workshop approximately one month later to criticize the proposals that were written and to facilitate transfer from a group or common proposal to individual proposals. This second workshop could lay the groundwork for

future workshops devoted to specific literature review, research methodology, data analysis and report writing.

9. The following planning committee will meet at the dean's office in the School of Education at Montclair State at 10:00 a.m. Thursday, July 1st: Glen Reeling, Tom Tully, Ed Ambry, Bob Rouse and George Heiss.

Attendance

Thomas Tully - Caldwell
Glenn Reeling - Jersey City
Harry Lejda - Jersey City
Robert Rouse - Monmouth
Laurence Bellagamba - Montclair
Caesar Gaza - Newark
Edward Taylor - Rider
Arnold Speert - William Paterson
John Sokol - U.S.O.E.
George Heiss - Montclair
Ed Ambry - Montclair

Absent: Glassboro
Trenton
Upsala

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - September 22, 1971
President's Dining Room - Freeman Hall - Montclair State College
George Heiss - Presiding

I. Administration and Participation in the RCNJC Work Conference to be held October 13, 1971 at Rider.

1. Ed Taylor led the discussion in planning specific details at Rider as follows:
   (a) Prices and menus: Lunch (Pot Roast $1.75), Dinner (London broil, $3.50) to be held in faculty dining room.
   (b) Dr. Elliott of Rider will offer GREETINGS at lunch.
   (c) College coordinators agreed to arrive early to help with orientation and registration. We need to encourage participants to stay for the dinner program at this time and determine the number who cannot.
   (d) Ed Taylor agreed to supply a secretary, name tags, yellow pads, chalk, moveable blackboards, etc. (other needs?)
   (e) A Dutch Treat Bar will be set up between 5 and 6 p.m.

2. During the discussion regarding those to be invited on the local campuses some of the following ideas were advanced.
   (a) Ed Taylor must have names and checks from each campus by Friday, October 8, 1971. Send or call:
   Mr. Edward Taylor Tel. 609-896-0800
   Assistant to the President
   Rider College
   Trenton, N.J.
   (b) For best results total number attending should not exceed 75 - 80, thus each campus might aim for seven or eight participants with an additional alternate or two.
   (c) Each campus coordinator will develop and carry out his own methods and procedures to recruit participants. Some will contact all staff; others will be selective. However, each coordinator will write a cover letter containing appropriate information and invite at least all those listed in our DIRECTORY.
   (d) We expect our participants to come to this program with some maturity as to ideas to pursue and background in conducting a systematic study.
   (e) Each coordinator will be sure to write his name and location on the form above the reservation blank.

3. During the discussion regarding the actual conduct of the program lectures, panels, and small group meetings it was agreed that:
   (a) All participants will be provided with a basic reference book based on the C.O.R.D. manual
   (b) Each of our own invited experts will be expected to provide some appropriate handouts and reference materials.

II. Completion of the DIRECTORY

1. We agreed to use November 1, 1971 as a dut-off date for input. Call Glenn Reeling at Jersey City and/or see the June 2, 1971 minutes for details.

III. Disbursement of Consortium Funds

1. A short financial report was given as follows:

Official amount of grant	$9,396.00
MSC deduction for overhead	242.00
Balance	$9,154.00
Amount expended to date for secretarial service, consultants, etc.	311.86
Balance on hand	$8,842.14

2. It was agreed that salaries for personnel of the consortium would be paid as directed in the grant contract.

IV. Special Request

Would each campus coordinator send four or five evaluation items to the consortium office at Montclair. These items would be used to compile a short instrument to be administered during the dinner meeting session of our program on October 13th. They could be Likert, Yes-No, or some other type item.

Attendance

Thomas Tully - Caldwell
John Smart - Glassboro
Glenn Reeling - Jersey City
George Rotter - Montclair (officially appointed to replace Laurence Bellagamba)
Caesar Gaza - Newark
Edward Taylor - Rider
Edward Ward - William Patterson (for Arnold Speert)
Kenneth Rystrom - Upsala
John Casey - N. J. State Dept. of Ed.
George Heiss - Montclair
Ed Ambry - Montclair

Absent: Monmouth (attended several planning meetings and participated in several phone conversations)
Trenton

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES
Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - January 25, 1972
Faculty Lounge - Life Hall - Montclair State College
Ed Ambry, George Heiss - Presiding

I. Informal Financial Report

Originally funded	$9,396.00	
Deduct College overhead	242.00	
Available to Consortium	$9,154.00	
Expended to date	2,876.86	
Balance on records	$6,277.14	
Bills outstanding (mail, telephone, proposal, Manual, etc.)	500.00	Approx
	$5,777.14	Approximate balance

II. Directories

It was agreed to proceed with both directories and not hold up for a series of revisions or additions at this time. Two copies of the basic directory, consisting of the collated Survey of Research Capability forms for each of the ten member colleges, were distributed to those coordinators present. Those colleges not present will receive their copies at the coming February 24 meeting.

The format of the abridged directory as it was developed at Jersey City State by Glenn Reeling and Harry Lejda was presented and discussed. The board authorized the co-directors to proceed with the printing. A printing estimate was obtained for five thousand 6 x 9 inch size copies at a price of $1853. It is expected that this figure will be considerably reduced because it was found that fewer pages are required than originally thought necessary. It is hoped that the preface and cover can be written within the next few weeks, thus completing the directory project by early spring.

III. Completion of the Fall Program

It was reported that three persons had agreed to write proposals for criticism, and twelve persons wanted: (1) to study examples of faculty grants now in operation; and (2) more information (guidelines and sources) regarding N.S.F., EPDA, early childhood and small grants in general. The board authorized the co-directors to set up a half-day session to complete our commitments to this program. LAST CALL FOR PROPOSALS! Will each Coordinator survey his campus again for persons who are still deciding whether or not submit one to our readers. We want to arrange this last session soon!

It was reported that two of our participants have gone ahead and are submitting proposals without going through a third criticism

session. This seems to indicate some consortium influence. Has this happened on other campuses?

IV. New Programs

1. Bradford Proposal. Dr. Eugene Bradford, Superintendent of Schools in Caldwell-West Caldwell, and three administrative assistants (Mr. Joseph Anderson, Mr. Thomas Jones, and Mr. Murray Peyton) were our guests. Dr. Bradford presented and discussed his idea for an Institute for the Study of Teaching.
Some basic questions which arose were:

   (a) Is our grant contract flexible enough to move toward a continuing operation or must we spend the money and complete our projects?

   (b) Do we want to move toward a continuing project or should we complete our projects and cease operation.

   (c) Should we at least endorse the Bradford proposal with a cover type letter?

   (d) Must a planning grant format be followed and submitted? Should we do it?

   (e) We need to come to a decision on what role we can, want or should play in this matter. (It is suggested that each person do some individual research on this idea prior to the 24th meeting.)

2. Gaza Proposal. Dr. Caesar Gaza presented and discussed his idea for a Computer Assisted Dual Workshop.
Some basic questions which arose were:

   (a) Does our consortium structure have the capacity to handle such a complex program?

   (b) Should Newark State apply to our consortium for funds to implement such a workshop?

3. Rotter Proposal. Dr. George Rotter presented and discussed his idea for a Practical Proposal Writing Workshop. This workshop would run over several sessions with the purpose of having each participant actively engaged in writing under expert guidance and finally completing a proposal by the last session. Details of this idea will be presented at the February 24th meeting.

4. Casey Proposal. Dr. John Casey discussed briefly his notion of the Consortium engaging in a soliciting and awarding program of small grants. Details of this idea will be presented at the February 24th meeting.

The next meeting of the RCNJC will be held at Newark State College at 10:00 a.m. Thursday, February 24, in Room B, Down's Hall. Dr. Gaza will send a reminder note and directions prior to the meeting.

We need all coordinators in attendance to resolve best the program questions identified above.

Attendance

Thomas Tully - Caldwell
Glenn Reeling - Jersey City
George Rotter - Montclair
Caesar Gaza - Newark
Kenneth Rystrom - Upsala
Edward Ward - William Patterson
John Casey - N. J. State Dept. of Ed.

Absent: Glassboro
Monmouth
Rider
Trenton

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES
Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - February 24, 1972
Room (b) Down's Hall - Newark State College
Ed Ambry, George Heiss - Presiding

I. Directories

Copies of the remaining unabridged directories were distributed while those for Monmouth were mailed. Several more copies will be made at Montclair State to accommodate additional requests. It was suggested that one way to handle this directory on the local campus would be to use loose leaf folders and place one copy in the library and the other be kept in the office of the campus coordinator.

The first draft of the abridged directory was passed around for corrections. The errors found will be corrected by Harry Lejda's secretary for the final draft. Ed Ambry and George Heiss have the responsibility for writing the prefatory remarks and seeing it through the press.

II. Completion of Fall Program

The co-directors will proceed to set up a third session to culminate the Fall Program. We are aiming for Wednesday, March 22nd at Rider College. It is hoped to arrange for a three part program involving the criticism of several individual proposals, a concurrent session emphasizing specific information regarding grants for college professors, and a third part later in the morning involving the total group in proposal analysis and criticism. (Note: Preparations have been completed and programs were mailed out. We are at Rider on March 22nd; coordinators please get attendance data to Ed Taylor by March 20th afternoon. Use your own judgment about allowing other than past participants to attend. Marilyn Berry will be there also.)

III. Bradford Proposal

The board again took time to discuss this proposal and agreed to give encouragement and some support. However, it recognized its contractual obligations to have first priority. It moved to send a letter written by Ed Ambry. (Draft of letter was distributed).

IV. Short Report on the N.I.E.

John Sokol presented a short review of the latest legislation dealing with our newest federal agency, the National Institute of Education. Basically it will become a constituent part of H.E.W. much like N.I.H. and NASA, but be parallel to U.S.O.E. It will:

(1) take over the now on-oing regional educational laboratories, research and development centers and other university centered research projects, and gradually reorganize and refocus these efforts.
(2) set up a foundation for post secondary education to give special attention to higher education.

(3) institute some 200 educational renewal sites around the country to facilitate government funding. A new feature is the Education Extension Agent, modeled after the "county agent" so well known in agriculture.

V. Spring Program and Terminating Consortium Activities

Some of the following ideas and questions were advanced during the discussion:

1. Despite financial and personnel limitations, we have achieved several major accomplishments. What can we do to facilitate the continuance of this group, yet close the official books this June 30, 1972?

2. How to gain the recognition and support of the department of higher education?

3. How to encourage continued cooperation between the department of education and higher education?

4. One campus reported a request from the department of higher education for a "research support model." None of the campuses present were aware of this.

5. It was suggested that we submit an interim report to these offices to tell what we have done in hopes of receiving some reaction from them.

6. After considering the several program proposals, the following generalizations were reached.

(1) Combine the Casey and Rotter ideas and set up a spring program devoted exclusively to proposal writing and during the same period make available to our constituents several consortium financed grants. Tentative dates for a three session program are: April 12, 26 and May 10.

(2) The following agreed to attend a planning meeting (March 9th at Newark State); John Casey, Caesar Gaza, George Rotter, Bob Rouse and George Heiss.

(3) The Gaza program could be carried out in the Spring of 1973. The consortium might give financial support with its remaining June balance. This would also (along with monitoring the grants awarded for the spring program) provide a purpose for the consortium to stay in existence through the 1972-73 academic year.

Attendance

Harry Lejda - Jersey City
John Smart - Glassboro
Edward Ward - William Paterson
Caesar Gaza - Newark
Kenneth Rystrom - Upsala
George Rotter - Montclair
Don Herring - Trenton
John Casey - N. J. State Dept. of Ed.

Absent: Monmouth
Rider
Caldwell

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES
Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

Minutes of Meeting - May 10, 1972
Down's Hall - Newark State College
Ed Ambry, George Heiss - Presiding

I. Directories

It was reported that the directories were in the hands of the printer and that the estimated cost of printing would be approximately $800.

Note: The directories were delivered to Montclair State the last week of June - please find several enclosed for your perusal. We have 5000 copies on hand, thus we need to develop a method of distribution early this fall.

II. Need for Data to Write Final Report

An appeal was made for each campus coordinator to supply the co-directors with pertinent information to include in the final report. This data may follow an outline such as - Impact of consortium efforts on (1) individuals, (2) the campus, and (3) statewide collective results. It was agreed this data would be provided by June 15th.

Note: As of this date not a single campus has responded.

III. Evaluation of Spring Program (Proposals and Grants)

It was agreed that a proposal review panel should be appointed and made up of the following persons: the three state department consultants, Glenn Reeling and the two co-directors. This group would evaluate the proposals and select those worthy of grants. Details of administration and evaluation were left up to this group.

Note: Thirteen proposals were submitted and evaluated by this panel on Friday, May 26th. Five of these thirteen were judged to be outstanding in their purpose, content and technical style. Therefore a decision was made to shift slightly the allocation of the total funds available for this purpose and grant five $400 awards instead of four $500 awards.
Notification has been sent to the thirteen applicants. The five selected for awards are:

Mrs. Mary Zmitrovich	Status of Nutrition Education in the State of New Jersey
Dr. W. Daniel Phillips	Learning Efficiency Using Visual Imagery and Verbal Summarizing of Lecture, Textual, and Pictorial Material
Dr. Joan T. Feeley	The Effects of a Special School Program in the Study of Television on the Television Viewing Habits of Fifth-Grade Children

Dr. Phil L. Nacke	Efficient Reading as a Function of Redundancy Reduction, Practice Effect and Selected Cognitive Variables
Dr. Edward G. Rockel	A Comparative Ecological Study of Tidal Marshlands ditched for Mosquito Control and Natural Marshlands in New Jersey

IV. Budget Report

The 1971-72 budget was reviewed and it was indicated that certain costs were likely to run higher than anticipated. After a discussion of possible ways and means to balance the budget, the campus coordinators agreed to a $25 reduction in their second $100 salary payments. Naturally we hope this won't be necessary.

V. Plans for Next Academic Year

A. It was agreed that the co-directors should discuss with the Department of Higher Education Consortium achievements and sources of possible future directions and support.

B. It was agreed that a meeting would be needed prior to Thanksgiving to deal with some of the following:
   (1) Distribution and use of Directories
   (2) Receive a report concerning the progress of the grant awards project proposal.
   (3) Report on any response from the Department of Higher Education.
   (4) Explore possible consortium projects for academic year 1972-73.
   (5) Since co-directors were appointed for a one year term, consideration should be given to the appointment of a replacement director or directors.

NOTE: The meeting referred to in V-B above is scheduled for October 25, 1972 at Montclair State College.

APPENDIX B

PROGRAMS

Fall Programs:

October 13, 1971
November 10, 1971
March 22, 1972

Spring Programs:

April 12, 1972
May 10, 1972

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

Caldwell

Glassboro State

Jersey City State

Monmouth

Montclair State

Newark State

William Paterson

Rider

Trenton State

Upsala

September 20, 1971

Dear Colleague:

The Research Consortium of New Jersey Colleges takes great pleasure in announcing a work conference entitled Writing and Funding Research Proposals, to begin October 13, 1971 at Rider College. More than ever before educators are turning to research for aid in solving the pressing problems surrounding them. Unfortunately, most research is undertaken by the larger universities and specialized centers, with only a negligible contribution coming from the smaller colleges. The goal of this consortium is to overcome this deficiency and accomplish a better balance among the teaching, research and service functions of its member colleges.

Two problems make achievement of this balance by individual schools difficult. First, there is no significant budgetary allotment at any of our colleges for a coordinated research program. Second, expertise in the areas of design, analysis, funding, or grantsmanship is largely absent. The purpose of this announced program is to take a first step in overcoming these two fundamental problems.

Since you have already evidenced interest in the Research Consortium of New Jersey Colleges, the Board of Trustees of the Consortium cordially invites you to attend the program enclosed. Please note that the program is spread over a number of weeks and consists of three sessions, each logically developing out of the preceding one. (See Profiles for a description of the principal leaders). It is hoped that those actively participating in these sessions will gain enough material resources, skills, knowledge and motivation to write a proposal worthy of submission for a grant. The reader should also note the value of this work conference to those persons contemplating or actually involved in writing a doctoral dissertation.

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

Caldwell

Glassboro State

Jersey City State

Monmouth

Montclair State

Newark State

William Paterson

Rider

Trenton State

Upsala

The nominal fee of $20.00 for all three sessions covers part of the food and material costs. If you plan to attend, please fill out the reservation blank and forward to your campus coordinator immediately.

Sincerely,

Edward Ambry
George D. Heiss
Coordinators of R.C.N.J.C.

Send the reservation blank to:

Campus Coordinator _____

Location _____

Phone _____

- -

RESERVATION BLANK

Enclosed please find a check or money order for $20.00 made payable to R.C.N.J.C. This covers luncheons, coffee breaks, dinners and resource materials for sessions on October 13, 1971 and November 10, 1971.

Name _____ Dept. _____

College Address _____

_____ Zip _____

Research Interest _____

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

- Caldwell
- Glassboro State
- Jersey City State
- Monmouth
- Montclair State
- Newark State
- William Paterson
- Rider
- Trenton State
- Upsala

PROGRAM

Title of Conference: Writing and Funding Research Proposals

Times and Place
First Session: October 13, 1971 in Student Center of Rider College, Trenton, N. J.
Second Session: November 10, 1971, same location
Third Session: To be announced

Format
First Session:

9:30	Registration and Orientation
10:00	Government Funding, Dr. David Kapel
10:45	Industrial and Foundation Funding, Mr. Robert Ludwig
12:00	LUNCH
1:15	Panel Discussion and Questions, Dr. Kapel and others
1:15	Panel Discussion and Questions, Mr. Ludwig and others
3:00	Small group work sessions, participants writing first rough outline with aid of group leaders
5:00	Break
6:00	DINNER
	Culminating Activities, Dr. Edward Ambry
	Principal Speaker, Dr. Bernard Kaplan, Director of Planning for the Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation of N. J. State Department of Education

Second Session: Similar format, but focusing on research design and data analysis. We have been most fortunate to secure the services of the following people for this session:
Survey Designs-Developmental Projects; Dr. Joseph Justman, Fordham University
Experimental Designs; Mr. Ernest Anastasio, Assistant Director Data Analysis Research Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J.
Performance Objectives-Management Systems-Accountability; Mr. Sherwood Wilson, Assistant Director, Educational Improvement Center, Pitman, N. J.
Details of this session will be announced at the October 13th session.

Third Session: For those participants who, after attending the first two sessions, write a proposal for professional criticism. Persons expert in analyzing and criticizing proposals will be secured to read those proposals submitted.

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

Caldwell

Glassboro State

Jersey City State

Monmouth

Montclair State

Newark State

William Paterson

Rider

Trenton State

Upsala

PROFILES

DAVID E. KAPEL, Ed.D. - Associate Professor of Curriculum and Instruction In Urban Education, Temple University with teaching responsibility in research methodology, urban education and advisement of doctoral candidates; formally Director, Veterans in Public Service Project at Temple University; presently consultant to Bureau of Research U. S. Department of H. E. W. and several school systems in the Philadelphia area; author of numerous articles on curriculum, programmed instruction and programs and counseling needs of disadvantaged students.

ROBERT N. LUDWIG, President of RRD Associates, a financial planning organization located in New York City; formally Vice-President of Community Counseling Services, Inc., New York City; works with a range of schools, colleges, hospitals and religious communities here and abroad; also presently consultant to the Archdiocese of New York Education Department; raises in excess of $1,000,000 per year from foundations and corporations.

BERNARD A. KAPLAN, Ph.D. - Director of Planning Division of Research, Planning and Evaluation, State Department of Education, currently project director for this department's Needs Assessment (Our Schools) project and president-elect of the International Society for Educational Planners; formally Associate Director for the vocational education division of the New Jersey Department of Education; author of articles and books on dropouts, educational and vocational guidance, his most recent book is entitled America's Problem Youth: Education and Guidance of the Disadvantaged.

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

Caldwell

Glassboro State

Jersey City State

Monmouth

Montclair State

Newark State

William Paterson

Rider

Trenton State

Upsala

PROGRAM

Title of Conference: Writing and Funding Research Proposals

Times and Place: Second Session: November 10, 1971 Student Center of Rider College, Trenton, N. J. (same as first session)

Third Session: To be arranged at conclusion of the second session

Format:

9:00	Registration
9:30	Orientation - Room 237
9:45	Experimental Designs: Mr. Earnest Anastasio Performance Objectives-Management Systems-Accountability: Mr. Sherwood Wilson Survey Designs-Developmental Projects: Dr. Joseph Justman
12:00	Panel Discussion and Questions: Mr. Anastasio, Mr. Wilson, Dr. Justman
12:30	Lunch. Short talks by Miss Marilyn Beary and Dr. Edward Ambry.
1:45	Return to room 237-break into workshop groups
2:00	Workshop - small group and individual help Experimental Designs-Mr. Anastasio, Dr. Rotter Management Systems-Mr. Wilson, Paul Winkler, Arthur Rainear Survey Designs-Dr. Justman, Mrs. Wendy Oxman
3:30	Break
3:45	Repeat above workshops to allow attendance at two different sessions
5:15	Large group meeting in room 237 to plan third and perhaps fourth session. Basic question: How many participants are now prepared to write a proposal to submit to a professional reader for criticism?
5:45	Dutch Treat Cocktail Hour
6:15	Informal Dinner

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM

OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

November 1, 1971

Dear Colleague:

You are cordially invited to attend the second session of the consortium program to be held November 10th at Rider College. Please note that it is fasioned to take us into the details of project planning, design and analysis. It is hoped that during the late afternoon planning session, we can determine how many participants will feel prepared to write a proposal for expert criticism. As you recall, the third session was to be devoted to both a group and individual critical analysis of each proposal submitted.

The persons planning this second session also took note of the many suggestions on the evaluation forms regarding the afternoon small group sessions and evening dinner. Therefore, the afternoon sessions are organized so that each group can arrange that working format which best meets its own needs within the pre-planning framework of its leader. The lunch hour will be used for business purposes so that the evening part of the program will be informal and relaxing.

If you plan to attend, please fill out the reservation blank and forward it to your campus coordinator immediately. If a colleague wishes to attend who did not attend the first session, we ask that he enclose a check for $10.000 to cover some of the expenses.

Sincerely,

Edward Ambry
George Heiss
Co-Directors of R.C.N.J.C.

- -

RESERVATION BLANK
(Returning Participants)

Name _____ Dept. _____

College Address _____ Zip _____

RESERVATION BLANK
(New participants - please enclose check for $10.00 made payable to R.C.N.J.C.

Name _____ Dept. _____

College Address _____ Zip _____

R E S E A R C H C O N S O R T I U M

OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

PROFILES

JOSEPH JUSTMAN, Ph.D. - Professor, School of Education, Fordham University. Assistant Director, then Director of Bureau of Educational Program Research and Statistics, New York Board of Education, Visiting professor at Columbia, Cornell and Buffalo. Author of numerous articles on research and evaluation. Co-author: Evaluation in Modern Education, The Effects of Ability Grouping.

SHERWOOD WILSON, M.A. - Acting Director, Educational Improvement Center, Pitman, N. J. Experience as elementary teacher, principal and superintendent. Works with school systems in such areas as PERT Training and Development, Project Management and systems, In-service training, Individualized Instruction and Grantsmanship. Author of articles in these areas.

EARNEST ANASTASIO, Ph.D. - Research Psychologist and Assistant Director, Data Analysis Research Division, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N. J. Working with and experience in computer simulation, computer assisted instruction, and testing and adaptive programming. Author of articles in these areas and related areas of psychology.

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLECES
Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

March 3, 1972

PROGRAM

Title of Conference: Writing and Funding Research Proposals
Time and Place: Third Session - March 22, 1972
Student Center of Rider College, Trenton, N. J.
(Same as first two sessions)

Schedule of Activities

9:00 Registration
9:15 Go directly to room 113 or 114
9:30 Room 113 - Review and Criticism of Submitted Proposals: Dr. David Kapel (only for those submitting proposals in advance of this conference)
Room 114 - Government Funding: Dr. John Sokol and others. More details on guidelines and sources of funding college professors grants under auspices of O.E., E.D.P.A., N.S.F., Public Health Service and National Endowment for Humanities.
11:00 Short Break
11:15 Room 114 - A Case Study: A Proposal Not Funded
All reconvene under the leadership of Dr. Ambry, Dr. Kapel and Dr. Sokol to go through a proposal turned down for funding and find out why.
12:30 Lunch - Faculty Dining Room (Same as first session)

****

Dear Colleague:

You are cordially invited to attend the third and concluding session of the consortium program begun last fall. Plans for a second series of workshops are under way and will be announced in the near future.

The schedule above speaks for itself and is an attempt to carry out our final commitments based on the program objectives and expressed needs of participants. You will recall Dr. David Kapel from the Oct. 13th session. Dr. Kapel has had extensive experience in criticizing proposals for government grants. Only a small group has taken advantage of this unique opportunity. Any others? Deadline is March 15th to George Heiss at Montclair State. Dr. John Sokol, Director of Educational Research for U.S.O.E., District Two, is an expert on O.E. funding. Other experts will be available also. The initial fees which you paid last fall will also cover this final session. If you plan to attend, please fill out the reservation blank below and forward to your campus coordinator immediately.

Sincerely,
Ed Ambry, George Heiss, Co-Directors

--- - - -

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES
Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

March 10, 1972

From: Spring Program Planning Committee

To: Consortium Coordinators

Please find enclosed a copy of the annoucement of our spring program. The planning committee asks that each coordinator see that a copy is immediately distributed to each faculty member of his college. Please note the last paragraph. This material is being developed now and hopefully will be ready within a week or ten days. Also note the importance of placing your name and extension number at the bottom of the annoucement.

The planning committee would also like to alert each coordinator to the need for some discreet screening on each campus. For example, we would not be interested in participants who have already been successful in obtaining large grants or those who are looking primarily for travel grants.

For additional details and questions, contact the committee members below.

John Casey
Caesar Gaza
George Rotter
Robert Rouse
George Heiss

GDH:s
Enclosure

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

ARTICIPATING COLLEGES

Caldwell

Glassboro State

Jersey City State

Monmouth

Montclair State

Newark State

William Paterson

Rider

Trenton State

Upsala

SPRING PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT

The Research Consortium of the New Jersey Colleges (R.C.N.J.C.) announces a program and four incentive awards designed to assist faculty of member colleges in developing research grant proposals. Meetings are scheduled at Newark State College on Wednesday, April 12, and Wednesday, May 10.

The purpose of this program will be for you to formulate (with the assistance of consultants provided by the consortium) a finished proposal, i.e., an application substantially ready for submission to an appropriate agency. The condition for participation in this program stipulates that interested faculty have a written outline upon which a formal proposal can be constructed. To assist you in constructing this outline, a series of specific questions are available (see last paragraph). By answering these questions informally, even in the vernacular, and in the order presented, you will have the basic outline for your full proposal. The questions follow the outline suggested by the U. S. Office of Education, although actual formats vary from agency to agency. The purpose of the Spring R.C.N.J.C. meetings, then, will be to help you strengthen your proposal, to answer questions where confusion exists, to fill in gaps and to evaluate and review critically your finished product.

Because the consortium has been financed through a U.S.O.E. grant and because the basic purpose of the consortium is to encourage faculty to become more involved in research and to seek support beyond the confines of their own campus, the consortium, as part of its spring program, will at the final session give four $500.00 awards to the four proposals adjudged by a panel of consultants to be the ones which are the best of those developed.

If you are interested, please contact your consortium representative (see below) who will provide you with the series of questions, an illustrative set of answers, application forms, and who will answer any other questions.

Local Coordinator _____ Phone _____

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

March 27, 1972

From: Spring Program Planning Committee

To: Consortium Coordinators

Please find enclosed a copy of the Spring Program schedule and application blank. The planning committee asks that each coordinator see that a copy is immediately distributed to each faculty member who plans to attend. Please note the extended role and additional responsibilities required from each coordinator to ensure the success of this program. These involve (1) initial screening of applicants to see that they have prepared rough outline for the first session, (2) eliminating those who are simply intending to re-submit proposals previously done, (3) eliminating those who are seeking primarily travel type grants, (4) providing some direction to those needing consultant help between the first and third sessions, (5) contacting Caesar Gaza several days prior to April 12 and May 10 sessions with member count, and (6) make some concrete evaluations of outlines presented and prepare a short annotation of each project (one sheet) to go over at the breakfast meeting.

This represents our thinking at the present time and has some tentative aspects. For example, we expect to start with a basic core of consultants in design, data analysis and budgets, but hope to add to this group if need and trends demand it. The May date may need to be changed, and it is not yet clear whether the so-called second session should be held as one large session at a single place and time or allow it to remain as basically a participant responsibility with support from coordinators.

For additional details and questions, contact the committee members below. Also, it appears important for all of us to get together prior to the sessions themself to review scope of projects we are dealing with. Would you make every effort to attend a breakfast meeting at 8:00 a.m. on April 12th just prior to the activities of that day?

John Casey
Caesar Gaza
George Rotter
Bob Rouse
George Heiss
Ed Ambry

N.B. Our total planning is built on a base of approximately fifty participants.

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

PARTICIPATING COLLEGES

- Caldwell
- Glassboro State
- Jersey City State
- Monmouth
- Montclair State
- Newark State
- William Paterson
- Rider
- Trenton State
- Upsala

SPRING PROGRAM 1972

Title of Conference: Supervised Proposal Writing Workshop

Times and Place

First Session: April 12, 1972 in Down's Hall Rooms A and B at Newark State College, Union, N. J.

Second Session: Individual Conferences between participants and consultants at mutually agreed upon times and places arranged individually and with the assistance of local campus coordinators.

Third Session: May 10, 1972 (tentative) in Down's Hall, Rooms A and B at Newark State College, Union, N. J.

Format

First Session:

9:00	Registration
9:30	Orientation and Awards Information
9:45	General Session, Part I; Panel of Consultants taking questions at random from total group
10:45	General Session, Part II; Total group divides into "more advanced" and "less advanced" sections for continued question-answer period
11:45	LUNCH
1:00	Interests and Needs Small Group Session; small groups of 6 - 8 work directly with consultants in research design, data analysis and organization, budgets (development officer) and curriculum. Participants may be involved in several groups during the afternoon
3:30	Session ends.

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

ARTICIPATING COLLEGES

Caldwell

Glassboro State

Jersey City State

Monmouth

Montclair State

Newark State

William Paterson

Rider

Trenton State

Upsala

Second Session: It is expected that participants after receiving the instruction and criticisms of the first session will now be able to rewrite their original outline into a rough first draft. While doing this difficult questions may arise and the participants are expected to seek the aid of consultants on their own or ask the assistance of the local campus coordinators in finding help. The original core of consultants may need to be expanded during this time period. They could also be available for the third session.

Third Session: Participants will reconvene at Newark State College and have with them a completed typed first draft. Consultants will be available for a final refining of these drafts.

9:00 Registration in Needs and Interests Groups
9:30 Individual and Small Groups according to needs-similar to afternoon part of the session of April 12 but more advanced.
12:30 LUNCH.. Culminating Activities: Annoucement of deadlines for submission of grants for awards.

- -

APPLICATION BLANK

Enclosed please find a check or money order for $10.00 made payable to Research Consortium of New Jersey Colleges. This covers some of the cost incurred for luncheons and services provided at the April and May sessions of the spring program.

Name _____ Dept. _____

College Address _____

Proposal Outline Title (Coordinators please check prior to April 12 session)

_____

_____

Campus Coordinator (Signature) _____

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES
Spring 1972 Program Consultants

BUDGETS AND GRANTS ADMINISTRATION

Foster F. Diebold, Director of the Division of College Development, Newark State College, Union, N. J.
Graduate work at Seton Hall University in Adminstration and Supervision. Served as Assistant Superintendent of Schools for Special Projects in Neptune Township, N. J. 1964-69. At present is a member of adjunct faculty, Division of Field Services, Newark State College and serves as a consultant to Field Educational Publications, Palo Alto, California.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Glenn E. Reeling, Director of Institutional Research and Professor of Psychology and Education, Jersey City State College, Jersey City, N. J.
Graduate work at Indiana University in Educational Psychology and Guidance, Ed.D. 1962. Served as coordinator of Testing and Research in Montclair Public Schools, 1963-66. At present is a member of the visiting graduate faculty of New York University and serves as consultant to the New Jersey Bilingual Education Program and Children's Television Workshop (Sesame Street).

George S. Rotter, Director of Research for the Educational Foundation for Human Sexuality, Montclair State College, Upper Montclair, N. J.
Graduate work at New York University in Social Psychology, Ph.D. 1964. Has published numerous articles in Methodology and Experimental Social Psychology. In 1965 was recipient of grant from Office of Education entitled "The Influence of Pupil Race upon Teacher ratings of emotional and social adjustment." At present is Associate Professor of Psychology and director of research for a three year grant from Applied Research Branch of NIMH for a study entitled "Sex attitude structure of teachers."

EVALUATION

Francis S. Pinkowski, Director Branch of Evaluation, New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, N. J.
Graduate work at Teachers College, Columbia University. Served as adminstrative assistant to Commission of Education, 1963-67 and as Director of Planning for Vocational Education, 1967-69 in the New Jersey State Department of Education.

TRAINING GRANTS

Robert E. Weber, Office of Planning, New Jersey State Department of Education Trenton, N. J.
Graduate work at the Universities of Buffalo and Minnesota in the social sciences and human growth and development. Ph.D. Philathen, Canada. Served as professor at Buffalo and Minnesota and later employed by the Rand Corporation and Lockheed Electronics. At present is publishing in numerous areas, among which are Compensatory Education, Special Education, Migrants, Early Childhood Development and Accountability. Served on President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

DATA ORGANIZATION AND ANALYSIS

M. Jack Krupnick, Director, Branch of Statistics, New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, N. J.
Graduate work at Temple University majoring in research in work physiology, Ph.D. Hebrew University in Israel. Served as public school teacher, College professor and administrator of community programs. Ha done research in numerous areas, among them are drug addiciton, dropouts, curriculum development and urban education. At present is responsible for planning, organizing and developing instruments for collection of the state's educational statistical needs, then organizing, analyzing the data and writing the final reports.

Robert J. Russell, Chief Data Processing, New Jersey State Department of Education, Trenton, N. J.
Graduate work in communications and program management at Glassboro State College. Has been employed in data processing field for 18 years. Designed and taught data processing and systems courses in New Jersey County Colleges. Designed and used data collection techniques and instruments in the implementation of PPB systems, research studies, and numerous State Department activities. Reviewed and assisted in writing research proposals with respect to design, data collection, data conversion, out put report format and data processing.

RESEARCH CONSORTIUM OF NEW JERSEY COLLEGES

Office - Montclair State College
Upper Montclair, New Jersey 07043

To: Participants in Spring 1972 Program

From: Program Planning Committee

Re: Incentive Awards Information and Conditions

The planning committee is gratified that there are at least ten participants who expect to develop proposals and thereby apply for awards. It has spent much time considering how best to select and administer the four $500 incentive awards it expects to grant as part of its training program. We present at this time the following conditions for your guidance:

1. Candidates for awards must be on the official roster of participants (April 12, 1972 meeting at Newark State).

2. (a) A final typed revised draft (2 copies) must be prepared and may be presented during the May 10th meeting. The draft might range between ten to thirty pages in length and shall include its proposed grant budget and a budget for the anticipated $500.00 award.

(b) Since the May 10th meeting is designed for final refining of re-written drafts, the final revised copies being submitted for incentive award considerations shall be delivered to the Consortium office at Montclair State College (E. J. Ambry or G. D. Heiss) no later than May 17, 1972.

3. A letter of transmittal must accompany each draft indicating what parts of the proposal will be carried out, how the award money will be spent (see attached simplified budget format) and to which granting agency (agencies) the proposal will ultimately be submitted.

Incentive Awards Information (continued)

4. Selection of proposals for incentive awards will be done by a panel selected from program consultants and the board of directors of the Consortium. It is anticipated that award annoucements will be made by June 9, 1972.

5. The U. S. Office of Education requires an accounting of its grants. Therefore, awards will be monitored by the Consortium through the requirement that a letter of progress be submitted to the consortium office (E. J. Ambry or G. D. Heiss) by November 1, 1972, indicating what parts of the project have been achieved, how the award money is being spent, and, if applicable, a final copy of the proposal and the name of the agency to which it has been submitted. If the application to an agency is to be made after November 1, 1972, a copy of the proposal actually submitted for funding and its letter of transmittal shall be forwarded to the Consortium on the same date the proposal is submitted to a funding agency.

6. Acknowledgement of Consortium support shall appear in any subsequent grant application or publication of the project results.

7. Please sign one copy of this memorandum and attach it to the letter of transmittal you present with your submitted drafts on May 10, 1972 or no later than May 17, 1972.

Signature of Candidate for incentive award _____

Date _____

Address _____

_____
Zip

Office Phone _____
Home Phone _____

Sent to: Consortium Board of Directors
Spring 1972 Program Consultants
Spring 1972 Participants